

years and tripled it in 10 years, called for huge new tax increases. Yet, when it came up for a vote—and only because Republicans forced a vote on that—it lost. It didn't get any support. I think it was 97 to 0. Not even our friends across the aisle could support the President's outrageous proposal back then. So why doesn't he come back with a new one? Why doesn't he stay at the table? Instead of going to Philadelphia tonight and raising money, why doesn't he call Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER, Minority Leader PELOSI, and Majority Leader REID into his office and sit down and do his job, just do his job?

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. On my way here, Mr. President, I had the great pleasure of running into the Redway family, a few minutes ago, visiting from the State of Connecticut. Jack Redway is a former public servant in the State, and he is here with his wife Sue and other members of his family. When I told them I was on my way here to talk on the floor of the Senate, they asked me what the subject was. When I told them the Senate is debating the debt, the deficit, and the budget, one of them said: Same old, same old.

We are here on the same old, same old issues. But the American people have had enough. They have had enough of the tax breaks and the special giveaways and the sweetheart deals that go to the special interests and that have driven our deficit to sky-high, intolerable levels. We are now at a turning point and really at a precipice where we simply cannot afford these kinds of tax breaks and sweetheart deals any longer, and the people of Connecticut are saying enough is enough to the same old, same old deals with these special interests. We ought to come together on a bipartisan basis. Not only do we have a right and opportunity, we have a responsibility and an obligation to say enough is enough and to eliminate these kinds of tax breaks that squander and waste scarce resources.

The ethanol subsidies have been voted on by this body, overwhelmingly, by Republicans and Democrats, rejected. And the reason is quite simply that we can save \$400 million each month, close to \$2.5 billion by the end of this year if we eliminate these subsidies on ethanol. We shouldn't be divided on this issue going forward. We ought to be united on a bipartisan basis because these scarce resources are necessary to make sure we do not

burden our children and their children with this kind of debt going forward.

The loophole that enables corporate jets to be depreciated at a faster and higher rate than commercial airplanes adds to the debt and the deficit in hundreds of millions of dollars. If we are serious about debt reduction and addressing the deficit, we should eliminate that loophole. It is about making the Tax Code fair and effective.

Over the last decade the big five oil companies have taken home more than \$1 trillion in profits while enjoying tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies. Those moneys, whether you call them revenues or taxes or breaks, whatever the nomenclature, whatever the rhetoric, they are a loss to the taxpayers and the people of the United States of America without any reason because these five oil companies are among the most profitable and lucrative in the history of the world, and they don't need that money.

It is time to say enough is enough to the kinds of hidden subsidies that go to special interests, and there are others that we ought to scrutinize and eliminate in the name of fairness and effectiveness in our government so that we can be serious about addressing our debt and our deficit.

Budgets are about choices. Some choices are not easy. We face tough choices, but we ought to put to use the common sense of the American people, to say enough is enough to the same old, same old hidden subsidies, tax breaks, special giveaways to special interests. Cutting Medicare benefits or Medicaid will not make us stronger. Firing teachers will not make us stronger. Forcing kids out of college will not make us stronger in Connecticut or across the country. None of these measures will make us stronger or fairer as a nation, nor will rolling back our investments in innovation and research, which are vital to the high-tech jobs of the future, nor will cutting our investments in the essential means of transportation—high-speed rail, so important to Connecticut. None of these cuts will bring back jobs, which has to be our priority.

Economic growth and job creation must be put first, and the way to do it is to eliminate the wasteful tax subsidies, the breaks for special interests. Eliminating them will make us stronger, it will make us fairer as a nation.

I urge us to come together and put aside whatever the labels and the rhetoric and the nomenclature as we call them and do the right thing to make our Nation stronger and fairer.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DAVID H. PETRAEUS TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David H. Petraeus, of New Hampshire, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I come to the floor as the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence to speak about the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to become the Director of the CIA. I wish to thank the majority leader for bringing this nomination to the floor in such a quick fashion because the committee, only earlier this week, on Tuesday, unanimously approved the nomination of General Petraeus.

I think there is no doubt but that General Petraeus is among the finest military officers and strategic thinkers of his generation. We are very lucky to have his service. He wrote the Army's counterinsurgency strategy and then applied it in Iraq, securing a military victory from what had appeared to be a descent into chaos and violence.

One year ago to this day, the Senate confirmed General Petraeus to replace GEN Stanley McChrystal as the leader of American and International Security Assistance Forces in Afghanistan. Since then he has shifted the strategy, implemented the troop surge, kept our coalition together, and today our military and intelligence analysts point to gains in the security situation and in the Afghan military and ability of the police to secure their nation.

General Petraeus's willingness to take on the Afghanistan mission also demonstrates his extraordinary commitment to public service. At the time, he was serving in Tampa, FL, as the Combatant Commander for Central Command, no longer directly in charge of a war zone but with the responsibility for not just Afghanistan but for 19 other countries as well. He agreed to what was a step down in the military "org chart" to take on the hardest military challenge in the world and to deploy from Tampa to Kabul. The Nation certainly owes General Petraeus a debt of gratitude for 37 years in uniform.

When he is confirmed, General Petraeus will be taking off the uniform to become Director Petraeus. He has clearly considered the differences in culture and mission between the CIA and the military, and now he will shift

his style to lead intelligence collectors and analysts rather than officers and enlisted troops.

As a matter of fact, in our hearing in Hart 216, there was a bit of levity when General Petraeus was asked the question about how he would transition from a four-star general to a civilian role as Director of the CIA. He said: You can be sure that when I arrive at the CIA, I will arrive without an escort and just simply get out of my automobile and walk into the building. Well, as we looked out in the audience at his confirmation hearing and we saw a phalanx of officers accompanying the general, it became very clear that it was, indeed, going to be quite a transition.

I believe—and I think this is the importance of this nominee—that General Petraeus understands the difference and is prepared to move into a civilian organization at a difficult time. Of our 16 different intelligence agencies, one is generally—and hopefully but generally—led by a civilian, although there have been seven military commanders in our history who have led the CIA. Of course, Leon Panetta is, in fact, a civilian.

I think we have to consider the timing of this: the winddown of two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan; the operation in Libya; a restive Middle East where the changes in an Arab spring are not fully known; an Israeli-Palestinian situation that has to it crisis dimensions; the North Korean situation with respect to the nuclear weaponry of that country; Iran, a very dangerous country with the potential of becoming a nuclear country; and, above all things, the fact that this September is the tenth anniversary of 9/11, and where there is non-specific intelligence that this country may well have a revenge attack against it. Therefore, I think General Petraeus's military service will come in handy. I think his analytical skills and ability will come in very handy. I believe he is the right man for the job at this time.

Through the confirmation process, the Intelligence Committee has sought to understand General Petraeus's vision for the CIA and how he will lead it through the challenges I have just mentioned. I believe he has answered these questions and has laid out his views.

General Petraeus has testified that he had discussed this possible move to the CIA with Secretary Gates as far back as last year. He even demonstrated that he knows the CIA culture and the lingo, saying that right after being sworn in he will call an "all-hands" meeting for all CIA employees and "will tell them up front right there that you all should know that I'm here to recruit you and I know that you're here to recruit me."

He has met with just about every CIA former Director and received their advice on running the agency, and he plans to put that advice into practice.

General Petraeus has written and testified he fully appreciates the mis-

sion of the CIA is to provide unvarnished intelligence assessments to policymakers, whether they like it or not. That is a fundamental point. The intelligence must stand on its own. It must be good intelligence, it must be streamlined intelligence, and it must be intelligence which has been subject to the best of analysis and red-teaming.

This was one of the questions raised during his confirmation: Would General Petraeus put aside his military commander's assessments and carry forth the agency's analytic view? He answered the question head on, pointing out that he has experience in the analytical field and in debating assessments to reach the best judgment possible.

General Petraeus specifically pointed to his academic background as well as his military command experience. He, in fact, has earned—and I don't think many people know this—a master's of public administration and a Ph.D. in international relations from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He has served as an assistant professor of international relations at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, from which he graduated, and as a fellow at Georgetown University.

So the culture and debate in the CIA's Directorate of Intelligence will not be new to General Petraeus, and he understands the importance of presenting clear analytic views.

While all Members are familiar with General Petraeus's recent positions in Iraq and Afghanistan, let me touch on some of his prior experience. Prior to command in Iraq, he served at Fort Leavenworth, KS, during which time he oversaw the development of the Army and the Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Manual. The importance of that manual is that it has stood the test of time since then.

Earlier in his career, General Petraeus served in Bosnia, where he was the Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations of the NATO Stabilization Force and the Deputy Commander of the United States Counterterrorism Task Force-Bosnia.

Prior to his tour in Bosnia, he spent 2 years at Fort Bragg, NC, serving as the Assistant Division Commander for Operations of the 82nd Airborne Division, and then as Chief of Staff of the Airborne Corps.

In addition, he has served in a number of staff assignments, including aide to the Chief of Staff of the Army; Military Assistant to the Supreme Allied Command-Europe; Chief of Operations of the United Nations Force in Haiti; and Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not only is this a man who has great experience, this is a man who has commanded, who understands the military, and who has produced for the United States of America.

From my meeting and discussions with him, his responses before, during,

and after our confirmation hearing, and based on his remarkable background, I am absolutely confident General Petraeus will make an excellent Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I hope his confirmation vote will be unanimous. That makes it a real mandate.

While we are here to consider the nomination of David Petraeus, I also wish to note and recognize some other people. First and foremost, Defense Secretary Bob Gates, a former Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense whose term ends today.

Secretary Gates has been a tremendously dedicated public servant throughout his career but never more needed and appreciated than his last 4½ years as Secretary of Defense. He has presided over the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. He has managed the largest organization in the world at the Pentagon. He has earned the complete trust and respect of both President Bush and President Obama and of every single Member of this body. That almost makes him an endangered species.

Secretary Gates is the model of the professional government official, and his leadership and his character is truly an example to us all. I wish him well as he goes back to the State of Washington. Candidly, on a personal level, I will never forget his service to our country.

Next, today is Leon Panetta's last day as Director of the CIA. I was very proud to be able to introduce Director Panetta as a native Californian at his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of Defense earlier this month. I can't say enough about the job he has done and my appreciation for the relationship we have had over the past 2 years. I think it is well known that when it first cropped up that he might be considered for CIA Director, I thought the service could be best served by someone with CIA experience. I can say here I couldn't have been more wrong. Director Panetta has stepped in when the Senate has had a hard time finding agreement and put together a note of confidence in this body that is unsurpassed, and I believe that is true at the agency as well. He has raised morale. He understands the priorities. He has set the priorities. And he was eminently prepared to be the commanding officer in the takedown of Osama bin Laden. Mr. Panetta's service as CIA Director was both unique and very special. And it is worth noting that, in a time when the Senate has a hard time finding agreement, Leon Panetta received 100 votes on his confirmation to be the next Secretary of Defense.

I hope and expect the vote on General Petraeus will be overwhelming as well. It speaks of the President's choices of such qualified and respected nominees and of their willingness to continue service.

Quickly, I would also like to recognize a person who will be, as of tomorrow, the Acting Director of the CIA, Michael Morell.

I notice that the vice chairman of our committee, the distinguished SAXBY CHAMBLISS, is on the floor. I believe both of us think that Mike Morell has given our Intelligence Committee nothing but the unvarnished truth. He has come in to meet with us; he has been prepared to answer questions; he has presented the facts. He is an articulate, strong briefer. He knows the Agency. I believe he is going to lead the Agency well until the beginning of September, as General Petraeus will complete his tour in Kabul in July, and then there will be a transition period as he returns home and resigns his commission. In the interim, Mike Morell will be in charge at the CIA. I think we both believe the Agency will be well served by his service as Acting Director.

Finally, I want to thank Mrs. Holly Petraeus, the wife of David Petraeus and the Assistant Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, responsible for the Office of Servicemember Affairs.

General Petraeus mentioned at his hearing that Holly has been with him for 37 years and 23 moves, and we thank her for continuing to share her husband with our country.

Madam President, you and I both know how difficult it is when we have a spouse somewhere else, let alone having a spouse somewhere in great jeopardy in wartime far from America, in countries at which we are waging war, year after year after year. She, indeed, is a very special woman, and I think the general is very lucky to have her as his spouse.

In the position of Director of the CIA, he will carry out one of the most important posts in our government. The Director is a senior member of the President's national security team and provides candid and objective analysis on every single national security issue this Nation faces. But the Director is also in charge of clandestine and covert operations around the globe. It is one of the reasons our oversight responsibility is so important in these areas: to see that the law is followed and to see that missions are carried out with the full oversight of our committee. The CIA Director is responsible for the security of the people of his Agency and for making sure their efforts are in keeping, as I said, with the Nation's laws and ethics. It is a unique and difficult combination of management, of intellect, and, most importantly, of character because things can go awry and one might elect not to follow the law. I believe that will not be the case with General Petraeus. I believe he will follow the law and he will do an excellent job. So I fully, 100 percent, absolutely support his confirmation.

I am very pleased to yield the floor to the distinguished vice chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, first of all, let me thank and commend the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence for her great work not only on this issue but on every other issue we have had the opportunity to work on together over the past 6 months. She has, No. 1, reached out to me and my staff every day to make sure we are doing the intelligence work in the way we both agree it ought to be done. She has done a magnificent job of leading the committee.

The nomination of David Petraeus is a classic example of how she has led our committee; that is, we need a very smooth transition, a very quick transition when it comes to the leadership of the intelligence community. What Chairman FEINSTEIN did was, as soon as the announcement was made on Director Panetta's move to be the nominee for Secretary of Defense and David Petraeus was going to be the nominee for CIA Director, she made sure all the background was done immediately so we could go ahead and schedule a hearing well in advance of the movement by Director Panetta to the office of Secretary of Defense, preparing for the confirmation of General Petraeus to be the next Director of the CIA. That is not always easy, but she made sure it got done.

I wish to commend, too, the majority staff director, David Grannis, as well as the minority staff director, Martha Scott Poindexter, for their work in doing the background that was needed to be done to allow this nomination to move very quickly.

It is a pleasure to work with Chairman FEINSTEIN. She certainly has the best interests of America and Americans at heart from an intelligence standpoint, and she is doing a terrific job. It is a pleasure to work with her.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I also rise to speak in favor of the nomination of David Petraeus to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. General Petraeus has had an exemplary military career, and I look forward to his confirmation as the Agency's 22nd Director.

Before I talk about him, I, too, would like to acknowledge his wife Holly for her service and support. In addition to supporting a military family during a number of long and unprecedented deployments and 23 moves, Holly Petraeus has also worked to protect military families from predatory lending practices. I appreciate her long-standing commitment and support of our men and women in uniform and want to thank her for joining her husband in answering our Nation's call of duty.

The strain on a military family cannot be overstated, and Holly Petraeus is certainly an individual who exemplifies everything that is good about how a military family needs to support the

military member. I truly commend her for her great service to our country in that respect.

The nomination of David Petraeus comes at a pivotal moment in our history as we face threats from across the globe. As a warfighter, he brings a unique perspective, having seen firsthand the tactical value of accurate and timely intelligence. This experience, in an era of unparalleled cooperation between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense, will not only benefit the military and the intelligence community but also the American people.

General Petraeus graduated from West Point in 1974, but he has spent the better part of the last decade on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. No matter what the task, David Petraeus has always answered this country's call. Most recently, after turning around the war in Iraq and putting us on a path to success, he left his position as commander of U.S. Central Command when he was again called upon for an unexpected deployment to Afghanistan. General Petraeus understood the importance of the mission and accepted the assignment with vigor.

After leading the surge in Afghanistan, many expected him to retire from the military and public service, but not David Petraeus. He has decided to accept one of the most challenging positions in the U.S. Government. As Director of the CIA, General Petraeus will face a number of critical challenges, many of which cannot be anticipated. However, without a doubt, the threat from terrorism will remain the focal point for the CIA and for the new Director.

The successful strike on bin Laden removed al-Qaida's leader but not the threat from terrorism. The al-Qaida core has been weakened, but their extremism and violence continues to spread through affiliates such as AQAP in Yemen and other like-minded radicals. General Petraeus understands these threats, and I look forward to working with him to make sure the Nation remains vigilant through these very uncertain times.

I recall very vividly my first encounter with David Petraeus. It was in Iraq when he was in charge of the training of the Iraqi security police and the military personnel. I remember standing on a rooftop outside of Baghdad and observing an operation, a training mission that was going on where Iraqi security police and military personnel were interacting and carrying out this training mission with U.S. military personnel. Just being around David Petraeus that first day, you could sense there was something special and something different about this great leader. The respect he commanded from all of his subordinates and the respect he showed to his superior officers was evident, and it was pretty obvious there was something very unique about David Petraeus.

Obviously, he has gone on to provide the right kind of leadership that America has grown to expect from our great military leaders, and certainly David Petraeus has exemplified the very best the U.S. military has to offer.

It is also important that we note, as Chairman FEINSTEIN stated, that there are some other folks who are moving to different positions or leaving public service who have been so valuable to the intelligence community.

I have had the privilege of working with Secretary Bob Gates as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a fairly regular basis. Secretary Gates will be the first one to tell you, he and I have not always agreed on everything. That is part of what makes this institution work so well and what makes our country such a great country. But what a professional individual he is. He has provided the exact kind of service as Secretary of Defense that has been needed during his years at the Pentagon, which have not been easy years. These have been very difficult years to move through the Iraq situation, the surge into Afghanistan, as well as to deal with all the other myriad of issues—from personnel, to health care, to weapons systems—the Secretary of Defense has to deal with on a daily basis.

I admire and respect Bob Gates so much, and obviously we certainly wish him the best in the private sector.

Leon Panetta moving from the CIA to the office of Secretary of Defense is a natural. As I have stated on this floor previously, I will miss him as the Director because I think he has done such an exemplary job. He came in without a lot of the experience from an intel standpoint that some folks thought the Director should have. But having worked with Leon Panetta when he was Chief of Staff to President Clinton, having worked with him as Director of OMB under President Clinton, I knew what kind of man he is. I knew Leon would adapt very quickly, and that is exactly what has happened.

He rolled his sleeves up and went to work. He has traveled around the world meeting not only with leaders of other nations, but he always makes sure he goes down and visits not just the station chief in the countries where he is visiting but the personnel who really are out there putting their lives on the line every day to try to protect America and Americans.

He has certainly gained the respect of every individual at the CIA, as well as Members of this body. Not only has he gained respect, but the morale at the CIA today is probably the highest it has been since I have ever been involved over the last decade with the CIA. I think he has done a magnificent job, and he is going to do likewise as the Secretary of Defense.

The chairman is right—Mike Morell stepping in for the next couple months will allow us to have a very seamless transition during the interim because Mike is such a gifted professional. He

appears before the committee on a regular basis, and he does provide the direct, unfiltered, raw kind of information we need to hear. He is a great individual. He has been a great leader as the No. 2 person at the CIA, where he will continue to serve. During the interim, he is going to continue that kind of leadership we again have grown to expect from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. So I am very pleased Mike Morell is in the position he is at this point in time so we will continue to have the right kind of leadership at the Agency.

Let me say, we had a unanimous vote in the committee on reporting out the nomination of David Petraeus. I, like the chairman, hope we have a very outstanding, unanimous vote today for General Petraeus to be confirmed as the next Director of the CIA.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman for his remarks. I would like to thank him also for his willingness to work as a bipartisan team, which, as he said, we have done. I think the dividends have been great for our committee in that we have been able to get an authorization bill passed, we have been able to effect some changes. We have been able to work together. Our staffs work together. In particular, I would like to thank Majority Staff Director David Grannis, and I would like to thank Minority Staff Director Martha Scott Poindexter for her work in this regard.

I think it is extraordinarily important that Americans know there is in the Senate of the United States a team of oversight that is, in fact, working together on a true bipartisan basis.

So I say to the Senator, Mr. Vice Chairman, thank you so much for that—it has been wonderful for me—and particularly for your friendship as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I rise today to applaud the military service of GEN David Petraeus and voice my support as he transitions from leading our Nation's troops in Afghanistan to leading our Nation's intelligence professionals at the Central Intelligence Agency. He is a man of outstanding moral integrity who has had a distinguished career in the U.S. Army.

Four years ago, General Petraeus was called "General Betray Us" by Moveon.org and other leftist groups. While I have always supported General Petraeus, others in this body have not. The general's rise, since 2007, to national prominence that supersedes party and ideology is indicative of the incredible nature of his service to our country.

When analysts discuss success of the Iraq surge in 2007 and 2008, credit is given to counterinsurgency tactics or to counterterrorism tactics. The "awakening" of the Sunni leadership has often been touted as the decisive

factor as has the marginalization of the Shia extremist militias. But I would submit to the Senate that the success of the surge had a singular root in the leadership of General Petraeus.

After successfully leading U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, our Nation once again called upon General Petraeus to lead combat operations in Afghanistan. As in Iraq, he developed and executed a strategy that took the momentum away from the enemy and began the process of providing a lasting stability in Afghanistan. General Petraeus has acknowledged that we have only begun to "get the inputs right" in that war-torn country. His leadership, rapport with the troops, interaction with our coalition partners, and efforts with the Afghan government have been decisive to the successes we have had in Afghanistan to date.

General Petraeus now moves on to a new challenge. He will lead the Central Intelligence Agency, which is now rightfully riding high in the wake of killing Osama bin Laden. His nomination to this position is an inspired choice that I am very happy to support. In General Petraeus, we have a leader whom we can trust as our Nation continues to prosecute the global war on terrorism.

Our Nation and its people owe General Petraeus and his family a debt of gratitude for their selfless service. They are an inspiration to this Nation, young and old, to spend their lives in service and support of our Nation—in the military where possible or in government service or private endeavors. There will be many speeches and many accolades for this inspiring leader, and rightly so. But let us give General Petraeus the tribute that any leader really craves—to look behind him, and see followers.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, it is my great honor to speak today in support of President Obama's nominee to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, GEN David Petraeus.

I want to take a few moments to describe what, I believe, Dave Petraeus has meant to our country and why he will be a great CIA Director.

GEN David Petraeus is the most distinguished general officer of the U.S. Armed Forces of his generation—and his generation has many impressive general officers. He is a true American hero who has twice been called upon by our commander-in-chief to assume leadership of a faltering war effort. And twice he has not only answered that call, but led our forces out of the jaws of defeat and onto the path of victory. To my knowledge, no one else in American history shares that record with Dave Petraeus.

At a moment when cynicism too often infuses our national politics, and partisanship too often affects our national security, General Petraeus has

won the confidence, gratitude, and respect of the American people—Democrats, Republicans, and yes, Independents. While commanding our extraordinary military in wars that have divided our country, General Petraeus has inspired and united our American family.

At a moment when too many of our fellow citizens fear our best days are behind us, General Petraeus' life and leadership have been a reminder that America is still a land of heroes—and that Americans are still very capable of achieving greatness.

This special debt of national gratitude extends beyond Dave Petraeus to his family, beginning with his remarkable wife, Holly. Holly Petraeus shares her husband's strength of character, intelligence, and devotion to the cause of public service. As many of you know, she is currently leading a noble mission of her own—protecting our military families from exploitative and manipulative lending practices.

By my rough calculations, General Petraeus has spent more than twice as many months deployed in Iraq or Afghanistan over the last 8 years as he has back home in the United States. Throughout all that time, Holly has been supportive of her husband's service and taken care of their gifted children. So today I know we all want to say: Thank you, Holly Petraeus.

General Petraeus' background and accomplishments would make him a superb candidate for any of the top national security positions in the U.S. Government. But there are a special set of reasons why I believe he will make a truly superb Director of the CIA in this time of war.

First, GEN David Petraeus is someone whose very name inspires the trust and confidence of America's friends, and the fear and anxiety of America's enemies. As our commander in Iraq, at U.S. Central Command, and now in Afghanistan, he has stood at the epicenter of some of our toughest, most intensive, and most effective counterterrorism operations. David Petraeus knows our enemies.

At the same time, General Petraeus has also built close personal relationships with our key partners and allies in the Middle East, South Asia, the Euro-Atlantic community, and around the world. Dave has also proven himself to be a capable leader of large organizations, larger even than the CIA. And because he is a scholar as well as a soldier, he is well-suited to oversee and improve the critically important analysis done by so many who work at the CIA.

After all he has done, General Petraeus would be well-justified in seeking a quiet, personal retirement now. But fortunately for the rest of us, service to a cause larger than himself is General Petraeus' creed and destiny. The brave and skillful men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency will be in very good hands when he is given the opportunity to become their leader,

and all Americans will be fortunate indeed, and safer, when General Petraeus is at the helm there.

And that is why I feel so personally honored to vote today for the confirmation of GEN David Petraeus to serve as the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am pleased to support GEN David Petraeus to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. For the second time in as many weeks, this body endorsed an exceptional nominee for a critical post. General Petraeus brings to his new position an incredible resume of warfighting knowledge and experience, strengthened by meaningful excursions into academia. After leading our troops in combat operations overseas for nearly a decade, I think he is well qualified to lead our foremost Intelligence institution to serve the needs of our Armed Forces and the Nation at large.

One of the most respected military thinkers of his generation, General Petraeus literally rewrote the manual on counterinsurgency operations. Understanding that the ability to think is as critical as knowing how to fight, he translated difficult and sometimes counterintuitive principles into a winning formula for a flagging Iraq campaign. In his latest post, his leadership has inspired hope for a positive outcome to our endeavors in Afghanistan.

Threats to our national security are ubiquitous, with those who plot against us living in all corners of the world and in the elusive halls of cyberspace. To defend our liberty and way of life, we rely on an intelligence service that is agile and proactive to swiftly defeat threats before they can harm us. General Petraeus has the rare combination of professional acumen and keen intellect to lead the Central Intelligence Agency in a way that anticipates the moves of our adversaries and keeps them off balance.

General Petraeus and his wife Holly will again unselfishly answer the call of public service at a time when our Nation demands great leaders. After 37 years, they continue to serve with vigor and distinction and I look forward to following their continued success.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today in ardent support of the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to be the 20th Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA.

First and foremost, General Petraeus deserves our Nation's unending gratitude for his unwavering commitment to this country over the nearly four decades that he has served in uniform. Since graduating from the U.S. Military Academy in 1974, General Petraeus has accumulated exceptional knowledge, acumen, and experience worthy of the legendary military giants who have matriculated at West Point. Throughout his long and distinguished career, he has demonstrated the highest levels of integrity and per-

formance, exceeding our Nation's expectations time and time again.

His numerous awards, distinctions, and decorations reflect the fact that General Petraeus is one of the superior military leaders of this or any generation, as he is the recipient of the Bronze Star Medal for valor and two awards of the Distinguished Service Medal. His accomplishments extend beyond our own beloved shores around the world, as he has also received the Gold Award of the Iraqi Order of the Date Palm, the French Légion d'Honneur, the Polish Order of Merit, the Order of Australia, and the National Defense Cross of the Czech Republic. Such accolades are a testament to the extraordinary leadership of General Petraeus and speak to an individual whose name is synonymous with excellence and respect.

One of the finest officers our Nation has produced, General Petraeus also possesses a brilliance that is only matched by his bravery. Consider just a few of the military milestones that have occurred under General Petraeus. He has directed operations that have halted and reversed the momentum in such Taliban strongholds as Kandahar and he positioned the United States to secure victory in Iraq when defeat often seemed inevitable. His tactical and strategic faculties are universally admired and are second to none. And as the commander leading U.S. and Coalition forces in both Afghanistan and Iraq, he clearly understands the absolute necessity of coordination between military special ops and intelligence covert actions—an imperative that was underscored with the remarkable May 1, 2011, take down of Osama bin Laden.

And I would be abjectly remiss if I did not recognize General Petraeus's wife Holly, their son Stephen, who has followed in General Petraeus's footsteps by serving in the Army, including a recent tour in Afghanistan, and his daughter Anne. His assignments since September 11, 2001, have taken him away from his family, far too often and for far too long. In fact, it is my understanding that General Petraeus has been deployed for more than 6½ years over the past decade, and I am sure that there have been many missed birthdays, holidays, and other family moments along the way. And so I would like to take an opportunity to acknowledge the family that has endured “23 moves” and state that all of you deserve recognition for your sacrifices and dedication to the Nation. Indisputably, our phenomenal military families at every level and in every branch of our Armed Forces are nothing short of indispensable to America's ultimate success in our missions. Our servicemen and women could not perform their duties as effectively without you nor could our Nation. Your sacrifices are your service and we cannot thank you enough.

Today, the U.S. Senate considers General Petraeus to lead the CIA at a time when daunting challenges to our

national security threaten America's unique position and stature in the world, when the threat of retaliatory strikes in a post-bin Laden landscape are alarmingly high, when uprisings across the Middle East and northern Africa continue to spread, when Iran continues to flaunt its nuclear ambitions, when the makeup of the Libyan opposition is still unclear, when the threat of cyber intrusion and attack is distressingly persistent, and when Islamic extremists continue to control large swaths of territory in such locations as Yemen.

Former Director—and now Defense Secretary—Leon Panetta has left the CIA on firm footing, having successfully rebuilt the agency's relationship with Congress, implemented efficiencies, and defended the best assets of the agency. General Petraeus will undoubtedly continue on this path, while striving to close such key intelligence gaps and others, as our security may depend on such efforts.

General Petraeus also will be tasked with leading the agency during a time of national austerity. As Senator FEINSTEIN, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, stated during General Petraeus's nomination hearing, "the nation's economic and financial struggles are requiring a new level of fiscal discipline, which means that the major increases of intelligence resources since 2001—and the CIA budget has virtually doubled in that time—will likely end and the intelligence community will have to do more with less." The arduous calibration between seeking efficiencies to reduce costs without diminishing in any way the agency's pivotal role in the national security apparatus requires the discerning vision and deft judgment that have been hallmarks of General Petraeus's illustrious tenure in service to our country.

General Petraeus must at the same time strengthen the bridges between our military commanders on the ground and the analysts in Washington. Intelligence assessments, which are so critical to the creation of sound policy, must accurately depict the situation on the ground and take into account the most recent tactical and strategic developments—fortunately, General Petraeus is supremely positioned to understand the needs of those commanders and to ensure that our intelligence meets their needs. As he stated during his nomination hearing, General Petraeus intends to "strive to represent the Agency position" and "convey the most forthright and accurate picture possible."

Like my colleagues in this Chamber, I applaud General Petraeus, who upon assuming the directorship, has pledged to retire from the military to which has given every fiber of his being. He recognizes and understands the necessity for independence. General Petraeus stated that he has "no plans to bring my military braintrust with me to the Agency" and that he would

"in short, get out of [his] vehicle alone on the day that [he] report[s] to Langley" underscoring that understanding and avoiding the mistakes of some of his predecessors.

General Petraeus has described the professionals of the CIA as, "the ultimate selfless servants of our Nation, individuals with extraordinary expertise, initiative, integrity, and courage in the face of adversity and physical danger." I could not concur with this assessment more, and frankly, we would be hard-pressed to find a nominee with stronger credentials than General Petraeus to lead this key national security organization.

The trust and the confidence that are lynchpins of General Petraeus's sterling reputation among all who have served under him extend to the U.S. Congress and the President. There is no doubt whatsoever that the general will arrive at Langley with an unprecedented combination of intellect and courage, and without reservation of any kind, I could not be more pleased to vote to confirm General Petraeus as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona

Mr. KYL. First, let me acknowledge that two of the great leaders of the Senate have just made very ringing endorsements of General Petraeus to head the CIA, which we will be voting on in about an hour and a half. I associate myself fully with their remarks because they are in such a good position to know, as chairman and ranking member, respectively, of the Intelligence Committee.

I think my colleagues will defer to their judgment about this. But more than that, most of us have gotten to know General Petraeus because he has been so involved in so many of the important policy decisions of this country, that we have all been able to form our own judgments and reach the same conclusion that the chairwoman and ranking member of the committee have articulated so well just now. I am glad to associate myself with their remarks.

Noting that no one else is on the Senate floor to speak further about this nomination, I would ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHER TAXES

Mr. KYL. Madam President, we are going to be foregoing a July 4 break to go back home to visit with our constituents in order to stay here, ostensibly, to work on the problem of the accumulating budget deficit and huge debt that the United States has taken on and the need to do something about that, in conjunction with the President's request that we raise the national debt ceiling.

What I would like to briefly address today is what seems to me to be an ob- session on the part of the President to

raise taxes. In fact, he is so fixed on this, it is so important to him to raise taxes, that he is willing to risk an economic crisis knowing that Congress will not raise taxes as part of this debt ceiling increase. And we should not. Not because we are trying to protect somebody but because higher taxes on an already weak economy would just make things worse.

Now, we can point to a lot of what the President has done since he took office that has made things worse, but I do not know of a single economist who believes that American businesses will be more likely to hire people, will be more likely to create jobs, if they are faced with paying higher taxes.

They will not. Everyone knows that. So when the President talks about raising taxes, he is talking about killing jobs, and I would like to speak about the three specific taxes that he has talked about. I know because I was the Senate Republican delegate in the meetings with the Vice President at which this was discussed.

I am not going to break the commitment that we all made to each other to not discuss things that the President has not already made public. So I will not discuss the many things the Democrats took off the table. They talk about Republicans taking things off the table, I think they have already made it clear that, for example, they took any changes in ObamaCare off the table. I will not get into that. I will not discuss other things that were a part of our conversations.

But since yesterday the administration's spokesman and the President specifically identified three of the things they did put on the table and wanted to discuss with us, I believe I might as well explain to you why we are not willing to raise these kinds of taxes. They are all job-killing taxes. They would all inhibit growth, which is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing.

What are these job-killing tax increases on small businesses and American families and other businesses? It is not, first of all, just on millionaires and billionaires and corporate jets. President Obama and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obviously using poll-tested rhetoric about only raising taxes on millionaires and billionaires and corporate jets. That sounds good. They want ordinary Americans to believe they will not be affected by the President's tax increase proposals. But the truth is, the provisions they put forward during the debt limit meetings with Vice President BIDEN would target small businesses and other job creators and many Americans who are far from being millionaires or billionaires.

I should mention right off the top that they never discussed with us in these meetings anything having to do with corporate jets. So I have not gone to look to see how many American workers are employed in the general aviation business.

I note that it was on a list that they gave us, but they never checked—I suspect that is more in the realm of political rhetoric since it does not, even under their proposal I have seen, raise very much money. But in any event, what have they actually discussed with us?

Well, the first thing they discussed was repealing something called LIFO. LIFO is a term—last in, first out—that is used by accountants as one of the methods of inventory accounting. For years there has been a question—and more than one-third of American businesses use this particular method of accounting. It is perfectly appropriate and legal and so on. But there has been some talk: Well, should we have everybody use the same standardized method of accounting? There have been proposals to do that in the past.

The problem is, what the Obama administration wants to do is not just to conform everyone to the same type of accounting but to actually go back and retroactively tax the businesses that have been using this accounting practice, which is perfectly legal, totally recognized by the IRS, and nothing is wrong with it. But they are going to go back and say: Because we are interested in raising revenue, we are going to put a retroactive tax on all of you who have been using this method of accounting.

They are more interested in getting money than in tax fairness, and that is why we are opposed to this. It would represent a retroactive tax increase on the 36 percent of American businesses that use this perfectly legal method of accounting.

Now, who uses it? Mostly it is people in retail businesses and manufacturers, many of whom are small businesses, I might add. To show what the impact of this would be—by the way, we first talk about creating jobs in the retail sector where consumers come in and buy things and in the manufacturing sector where they are made. These are the very folks who use this method of accounting.

Here is the effect that it would have on small businesses. In September 2009, the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy—which is under the Obama administration—wrote to the Tax Reform Subcommittee of the President's own Economic Recovery Advisory Board that repealing LIFO "would result in a tax increase for small businesses that could ultimately force many small businesses to close."

Why on Earth would we impose a tax retroactively on folks who probably—at least according to the President's own Small Business Administration—would ultimately have to close their business as a result of the imposition of this tax? Why would we do that? Should that not at least be taken into account before you propose something such as this or are you so obsessed with finding somebody to raise taxes on or getting revenue that it does not matter?

With unemployment at 9.1 percent, we should not raise taxes on America's job creators.

Here is the second one they discussed: capping itemized deductions. They proposed capping itemized deductions for upper income taxpayers either at the 28 or 35 percent level. Obviously, this reduces the ability of taxpayers to buy homes, to make gifts to charity, to pay medical expenses, all of the things for which deductions are taken.

As the Wall Street Journal editorialized on June 29:

The political point of this exercise is to raise marginal tax rates without appearing to do so.

That is exactly what would happen. That editorial points out that President George H.W. Bush agreed to a similar proposal as part of his 1990 budget agreement that broke his "read my lips" promise not to raise taxes. But the fact is, half of all small business income falls into the top two brackets. So the ability of small businesses to grow and create jobs would obviously be harmed by this proposal.

The fact is, most high-income taxpayers—individual taxpayers—already lose the benefit of tax deductions and credits at their income level because of what is called the alternative minimum tax. Each year we eliminate the effect of the alternative minimum tax except on those making, I believe it is above \$250,000. So the very people who would be capped are already capped under the AMT. Who would get hurt?

Well, we know 50 percent of the taxes paid by small businesses are paid by these two upper brackets because they pay individually. It is those folks who cannot take this that would get hit by this because they have to take the deductions as part of their businesses. They would end up having their deductions capped and be unable, therefore, to invest that in hiring more people. Moreover, the tax increase would hit a much larger segment of American families than just millionaires and billionaires.

According to the IRS, in 2008, the last year for which we have numbers, only 319,000 tax returns showed income of \$1 million or more. But in that same year, the number of returns falling in the 33- and 35-percent brackets, which are the brackets most affected by this proposal, numbered more than 3.6 million. In other words, more than 10 times the number of filers would be hit if only millionaires and billionaires were affected.

So while the President likes to claim he only wants to tax millionaires and billionaires, the fact is his proposal would hit small businesses and millions of Americans who are not millionaires. But as I said, most importantly, it affects job creation because the people who would be hit by this are the people who are small business entrepreneurs, who pay their taxes under these provisions, and would no longer be able to deduct their business job expenses.

Why, with economic growth at just 1.9 percent in the last quarter, would

Congress want to raise taxes on small businesses and on American families? It just does not make sense.

Finally, oil and gas. It is always popular to talk about attacking Big Oil. Of course, millions of Americans and retired Americans own stock in oil companies, and raising taxes would have the effect of both reducing what they get in their pensions and so on, as well as undoubtedly result in higher gasoline prices because most of these kinds of taxes are passed right on through to the consumer.

So they want to raise taxes on U.S.-based oil and gas companies—not foreign-owned companies—U.S.-based oil and gas companies. Obviously, this tax could result in higher gas prices which contradicts the reason for releasing oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve. Why do that if it is going to get canceled out by imposing a new tax?

It could, obviously, hurt job creation because this industry supports over 9.2 million American jobs. It does not just target oil companies because they get some kind of special benefit. What these provisions do is eliminate a tax provision applicable to all businesses—any manufacturing business, for example, has the benefit of these particular three tax provisions.

So why single out one particular group of taxpayers, only about five in number, who would no longer be able to take advantage of provisions that every other American business can take advantage of? They are broadly available to American businesses in one form or another. They are three specific things: First, the so-called section 199 deduction available to all manufacturers. Second, the U.S.-based businesses are generally able to prevent double taxation. When they have to pay taxes abroad, those taxes are then credited against their American tax burden. Third, most businesses can expense their research and development costs.

These are the three things that would be taken away just from oil companies, the folks who find American oil so that we can drive our cars and conduct our businesses. So raising the cost of producing American oil would help our foreign competitors and make us more dependent on them, ship high-paying jobs offshore, increase our dependence on foreign oil, cause gas prices to rise, and hurt American families already suffering with high food and energy costs.

Why would we want to do this except to demagogue a political issue? Because it sounds good to punish success. America has never been about punishing success. America has been all about creating opportunities, and this President's ideas of raising taxes as the sine qua non of an agreement to achieve an increase in the debt ceiling, as he has proposed, would be absolutely contrary to what we are all trying to do right now—which is to help our economy get healthy so that it can create more jobs, so we can reduce this

tremendously high unemployment rate that we have right now, put Americans back to work, and help our families ironically, by getting healthier economically, making more money, and producing more revenue for the Federal Government to tax under our existing taxes. So if we want economic growth, improvement in the economy, the last thing we should be doing when our economy is ailing now is imposing a higher tax burden on it.

Why the President is so obsessed with this, I do not know. But I will tell you one thing: Republicans will resist these job-killing tax increases, not because we are trying to protect somebody—except the American people—but because we know that it is bad for our economy, for our families, for our businesses, and for job creation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 2011]

A STEALTH TAX HIKE—THE RETURN OF THE DEDUCTION PHASE-OUT GAMBIT

The White House wants Republicans to agree to tax increases that no one wants to call tax increases, and for an insight into this political method let's focus on one proposal in particular—the phase-out of itemized deductions for upper-income taxpayers. We hope the tea party is paying attention, because this kind of maneuver is why people hate Washington.

The idea is that once taxpayers earn a certain amount of money (say, \$200,000), they would begin to lose the value of the various deductions they're entitled to under the law. These include such IRS Form 1040 line items as the personal exemption, the deductions for state taxes and charitable contributions, even those for spouses and children. Earn enough money and soon the value of those deductions goes to zero.

The political point of this exercise is to raise marginal tax rates without appearing to do so. The top statutory individual rate would remain at 35%, so the politicians could claim they hadn't raised rates. But for those losing their deductions, the marginal rate would increase by between one and two percentage points until the phase-outs were complete.

We raise the alarm now because this sneaky bit of political fiddling last became law during a previous bipartisan budget summit—in 1990. Democrats proposed it then, too, and President George H.W. Bush and his budget chief Dick Darman agreed to it so they could appear to be raising tax rates less than they really were.

Those deduction phase-outs continued to be part of the tax code until the 2003 tax law finally phased out the phase-outs. They are scheduled to return when the George W. Bush tax rates expire at the end of 2012. While the statutory top rate will then rise to 39.6%, millions of taxpayers will pay a top rate closer to 41% as they lose their deductions. This is in addition to the 3.8% payroll tax increase on investment income that will hit millions of these same taxpayers when ObamaCare gears up in 2013.

Only six months ago, President Obama endorsed the extension of the Bush rates (and the end of the phase-outs) for two more years, but now his negotiators want to renege on that deal. They want to reintroduce the phase-outs as part of a debt-ceiling deal,

apparently so they can claim they got Republicans to agree to some "revenue increases" in return for spending cuts. Some Republicans might be tempted to go along claiming they didn't raise tax rates.

They'll deserve only scorn if they do. Republicans will be signing on to a tax increase, and one of the more dishonest varieties at that. The phase-out gambit is an attempt to shoe-horn more progressively into the tax code without admitting it, and to do so in such a way that only tax experts will know what's going on.

One goal of the tax reform that Republicans and Mr. Obama keep talking about is to simplify the tax code, but deduction phase-outs make the code far more complicated. Phase-outs make it impossible for taxpayers to add up their income, look at the tax tables, and know what they owe. The IRS taxpayer advocate service and even the head of the American Bar Association's tax section urged their repeal in the 1990s.

Democrats keep telling us Americans support raising taxes. If that's true, the least they can do is try to raise them honestly.

Mr. KYL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam President, I thank Senator KYL for his eloquent speech on the issues of the day that are obviously very serious for the American people.

Madam President, I am here to speak on a couple of issues—first and foremost, regarding the Asset Forfeiture Responsibility Act of 2011, an act that I have filed and will speak on in a moment.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam President, I want to comment on Secretary Gates' last day over at the Pentagon. I was over there doing some work, and I noted that he was being honored today. I thank him for his dedication and service to our country. He leaves behind an incredible record of service.

Our military and families, while strained, have never been more prepared to fight and win in today's conflicts. From my interaction with him, I have gained an enormous level of respect for his tireless leadership and committed resolve on behalf of our men and women in uniform and their families.

Mr. Secretary, thank you for your incredible service to this Nation. You have made us all proud.

Madam President, today, one of our Nation's finest officers, GEN David Petraeus, leaves behind a distinguished record of military service and moves on to a new job. The wealth of experience he brings to this critical post will be invaluable as he and the other dedicated public servants at the Agency work to keep our Nation safe from harm. I have the utmost faith in his leadership and look forward to the contributions he will make to the Agency and to our country.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1312 are printed in today's RECORD under

"Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. On a side note, I am hopeful that we will continue to work together and try to get through a lot of these fiscal challenges we have. I, for one, along with many others, look forward to finding common solutions to move our country forward and step back from the financial precipice we are approaching.

I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be divided equally to both sides, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time to talk about the budget issues and the debt ceiling vote that is approaching. It is a serious issue that we need to deal with.

First, I think it is important to know how we got here. I say that because we don't want to repeat the mistakes we made in the past. It was just 10 years ago when we had not only a balanced budget, we had a budget that looked like we were going to pay off all of our privately held debt. I was part of the Congress that moved us toward that balanced budget and surplus. It was the Democrats who were prepared to do what was necessary to balance the Federal budget in the 1990s, and we got there. We didn't have a single vote from Republicans, but we balanced the budget in the 1990s. It was the right thing to do for our economy. As a result, our economy picked up and did extremely well.

We also know that the previous administration cut taxes twice, in 2001 and 2003. We also went to war in Iraq—a war that was one of choice—and we went to war in Afghanistan, and we didn't pay for either one of those wars. It was these unpaid-for wars and tax policies that led us from a surplus to a deficit. Our economy then turned, and we now have these large deficits. I say that because we need to pay attention to how we got here to make sure we have a credible plan to get us out of this deficit.

I think it is very important that this country move toward a manageable debt. It is very important for our economy, and for job growth, that we manage our deficit and bring it down.

Let me give you what I think needs to be done in any plan that is presented to us for consideration. I hope we all agree that we need to raise the debt ceiling. That is after the fact. We have already spent the money. Now we have to pay the bill. We also would like to see a plan to bring our deficit under control. To do that, we have to have a credible plan, one that really does

bring us within the realm of a manageable deficit.

Secondly, it has to be fair. I notice that my Republican friends ask our children to give up some of their help for a college education. They want to cut the Head Start Program, and they want seniors to pay more for health care. How about the well off? Should they not be part of the plan? I think we need to have a fair plan in order to accomplish our goal.

Third, we need to allow our Nation to move forward with economic growth. Jobs are critically important to deal with the deficit. As we create more jobs, we help our economy grow, it brings our budget into balance.

I am for a credible plan. To me, a credible plan needs to get the job done. Managing our deficit needs to be fair, including all elements of government spending, and it includes tax expenditures. It has to allow for economic growth. If we are going to get the job done, we have to bring down spending—we all acknowledge that—on the domestic side and the national security side. We can do better in bringing our troops home from Afghanistan and save military dollars.

There are things we can do, and we need to do that. But we also have to deal with the revenue side. Quite frankly, we can't get the job done without dealing with the tax loopholes and shelters that we have in the Tax Code. I am concerned that the Republican leader said we could not consider any revenue. Well, I have heard from a lot of my Republican colleagues who disagree with that. We need to include revenues in a credible plan or it can't get done. We cannot manage the deficit without closing those loopholes and eliminating those shelters.

Yesterday, I talked about one of those—the ethanol subsidy. We have nearly \$3 billion that we can save there. The ethanol subsidies are not needed. The market is there. More damaging, it is hurting our economy. I have the honor of representing the people of Maryland and the Delmarva Peninsula. The poultry industry is suffering because of the ethanol subsidies. It is costing more to produce poultry, making the industry less competitive. We can save and create jobs by eliminating the ethanol subsidy, which will help us in balancing the budget.

Today, I want to talk about another tax shelter and loophole that we can deal with, and that is the section 199 manufacturing tax break used by the oil and gas industry. It is very interesting. We have seen gasoline prices rise, and we have seen the negative impact of that on our economy. But guess who is benefitting from the increase in the gasoline prices? You are right; it is the oil and gas industry. Their profits are up, while our economy has been suffering.

In the first 3 months of this year, the gas and oil industry, the five largest companies, had record profits of \$35.8 billion. Big Oil benefits from a variety

of subsidies, including section 199, that amount to some \$4 billion annually. So we are subsidizing the Big Five, who are on course to make a projected \$140 billion profit in 2011, with \$4 billion in taxpayer contributions. It is not needed. These funds could be used to help reduce our deficit instead.

The worst part is that section 199 came about as a result of our Foreign Sales Act. What was that about? We wanted to put American manufacturers and producers on a level playing field for international competition. We tried to do that with a direct subsidy to help exporters, but the World Trade Organization held that to be illegal. So then we came back with this general manufacturers' credit, section 199, to try to help our exporters.

The gas and oil industry are not manufacturers exporting a product. They should never have qualified for this taxpayer-funded subsidy. I asked that question in the Senate Finance Committee when we had the Big Five oil companies' chief executive officers (CEOs) before us. Not one of the CEOs could justify the fairness of this subsidy going to the oil and gas industry. Their only answer was: Well, everyone else is getting it.

We need to reduce unnecessary government spending, whether it is on the appropriations side or the tax expenditure side. With regard to the oil and gas industry, repealing section 199 and the rest of the \$4 billion or so in subsidies these companies receive each year could help us balance the budget.

But the minority leader says we can't even consider that. He says we can't consider any of the revenues. To me, it is not a fair proposal, not a credible proposal, unless we tell the most wealthy and those companies that don't need the subsidies that they are going to be part of the plan to bring our budget into balance.

There are many more provisions in the Tax Code we can look at where we can get the savings. I have just mentioned two. If we are going to have a credible plan that will allow for economic growth and allow us to create jobs—and the best way to deal with the deficit is to create more jobs—then we have to have a fair approach. So I urge my colleagues to get together on this.

Look, I understand it is not going to be the budget the Democrats want, but I will tell you this: it will not be the budget the House Republicans want either. We have to work together, Democrats and Republicans. I think we can find common ground. Earlier this year, I think 62 Senators signed a letter saying, let's use the framework of the debt commission. So I think there was that willingness. Let's get back to that.

Let's get the Democrats and Republicans working together in true compromise. We don't have to compromise our principles. We can get the job done, and that job means let's get our debt into a manageable state, let's do it in a way that is fair, so the well off also are part of a solution that includes rev-

enues, and let's do it in a way that allows America to do what President Obama said we can do—out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build our competitors so we can create the jobs that won't just help us balance our budget but will keep America prosperous, too.

That is our charge. That is what we need to do. Let's get on with the work. With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, before I start my remarks, I would like to say that in about an hour we will start voting on the nomination of General Petraeus to lead the CIA, and I am going to enthusiastically support that nomination because I do think General Petraeus has shown the kind of military leadership that makes our country proud. He has come in at some of the hardest times in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I have met with him in Iraq to see exactly what he was doing, how he was implementing his counterinsurgency proposals, and I think he is a gifted leader.

I also believe in this war we are in—the war against terrorists—the CIA and the military have such a necessary link, and in many ways they are co-dependent on the information and the capabilities that each uniquely has. So I think he will do the same great job he has done in public service in this kind of arena that has become much more closely linked to the military, for sure. So I will support his nomination.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, today, so many people have been talking about this debt ceiling issue, which should be what we are talking about because we have perhaps only as long as 1 month—we are not exactly clear—when we will reach that over \$14 trillion debt ceiling. This is the most serious issue facing Congress and the President today, and we shouldn't be doing anything else except talking about how we are going to bridge this gap that would allow us to go forward with significant reforms.

I will not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless there are not significant reforms that assure we will not have to do it again; that we will begin to bring down the deficit that is causing this huge debt to accumulate. So I am looking for the leaders who are meeting in the different meetings—some I am privy to—to essentially come to an agreement so we can send that message.

People have talked about the message that would be sent to the world if the debt ceiling isn't lifted. I am concerned about the message that would be sent if we lift the debt ceiling without reforms. I wish to send the message to the global marketplace that we are going to deal with our financial situation, and we are going to deal with it responsibly; that we are going to cut the spending that has caused this debt to accumulate to such alarming levels. The message I wish to send to the world is, we are going to take this

problem and we are going to solve it together; that we are not going to just do another pro forma lifting of the debt ceiling as if it were business as usual. Because business as usual it is not. We don't have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem, and we must attack it if we are going to have credibility.

That brings me to a bill I have introduced because I think it is important, as we are looking at this looming deadline, to have a plan B. If, in fact, we are not going to be able to come to an agreement—both Houses of Congress and the President—that would cut the spending levels sufficiently enough that many of us would be comfortable with in order to pass a bill raising the debt limit ceiling—if we don't meet that test—we should have a responsible plan B. This would be a plan that would say: If, in fact, we can't agree on what it will take to lift that debt ceiling, this is how we are going to treat the money that will be coming in. Because at that point our government will be limited in its expenditures by the revenue that is coming in.

We can allocate that revenue, and that is where I think we must have a plan B. We must make sure certain things are done. The No. 1 thing we all know that is going to be paid is the interest on the debt. That is our No. 1 responsibility because that will keep us from going into default, which none of us wants to do. The second thing is to pay our military—the people who are deployed overseas, in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the places that are supportive of those efforts. We must assure we are paying those people on time so their families, who are thousands of miles away in other parts of our country, will know they can pay their rent and are not going to go into extremist positions.

MILITARY PAY

I wish to talk about a bill I have introduced that has 80 cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HELLER of Nevada to be a cosponsor of S. 724.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

S. 724 is the Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act of 2011. There are 80 cosponsors of this legislation. It is very simple and straightforward. It ensures that in the event of a government shutdown, our Nation's men and women in uniform would continue to receive their military pay and allowances. That is what it does. This legislation will protect all Active-Duty men and women, including those in the Coast Guard and Reserve components.

I introduced this bill earlier this year because we were in the process of having a meltdown with our appropriations. We need to have a law that assures if there is a shutdown, whether it is on an appropriations issue or on a budget issue or on a debt ceiling issue, we know where the money will go—where the protections will be. I think

our military should be front and center. I also think Social Security recipients should be front and center, but this bill is for the military because they are in harm's way as we speak in many places around the globe and we don't want to disrupt their families or have them worry for 1 minute about their families while they are doing their duty.

These military families have faced stress from repeated deployments since 9/11. The last thing they should worry about is not receiving their paycheck on time because Congress and the President have not been able to do the job they need to do.

Immediately after introducing this bill, I was contacted by a military spouse. Her husband was on his 10th deployment in support of operations in the Middle East. The spouse was at home raising their 1-year-old son. She was very concerned about whether she was going to be able to pay her bills. Multiply that story by many thousands and one can imagine the stress of these families across our Nation who have loved ones in harm's way. This should not be compounded by adding an unnecessary financial stress that is the fault of a Congress unable to pass an appropriations bill or a Congress and President unable to reach an agreement to cut our deficit so the debt ceiling will not have to be raised again.

At a time when our Nation has 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and 45,000 in Iraq, it would be unconscionable to ask our troops to serve on the front lines without ontime pay. From my home State of Texas, there are more than 28,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines currently deployed. This is second only to California in the highest number of deployed troops from one State.

I would like to especially recognize the soldiers from the 36th Infantry Division of the Texas National Guard. They are currently serving in the southern region of Iraq and are doing a great job. These brave Texans are working long hours in the extreme heat, facing a dangerous enemy. But the most remarkable aspect of their service is they all raised their hands to volunteer to do it. The very least we can do is pay them on time. It would be tremendously damaging for morale to tell our troops to go on long deployments, maybe multiple deployments, away from their families, and then not pay them at the normal time.

I know if there is one thing this Congress can agree on, it is our tremendous pride and support for the brave men and women in uniform. I think Congress has shown that time and time again. We all learned a lesson after what happened during the Vietnam war and after the Vietnam war, when the disagreement about the policies of the war were actually imputed to those who were following orders to implement that war. We will never let that happen again. It hasn't happened since, and it will not happen. There is not one

Member of Congress who doesn't respect our military and the service they are giving—even if they disagree with the policies, which many often do. So I wasn't surprised when I introduced this bill to get 80 cosponsors immediately.

It is becoming clear that negotiations on a long-term deficit reduction plan may go down to the wire. The President said yesterday he will insist on tax increases to pay for a continued Federal spending spree. Republicans are clear: We must lower government spending to affordable levels, and there must be fundamental changes in how Washington spends the American taxpayer dollars. Now is the time for Congress to vote to assure that our troops will not miss a paycheck due to gridlock in Washington, not at midnight on August 2 or whenever we are adjourning, hopefully, for a recess so Members can get home and work in their districts.

If the Senate cancels its July 4 holiday recess—which is now on the books—it is time for us to spend that time on nothing else but this issue—long-term deficit reduction. We should start our work by making sure we have a plan B that our troops and their families will not be political pawns in the struggle between raising taxes and cutting spending. If we are here, it should be for one purpose and one purpose only; that is, debt reduction and the preparation for what happens if that deadline passes and there is not an agreement.

I can't think of a better way to say we are preparing for the worst while we are hoping for the best, and that is that we make sure certain essentials are done.

Obviously, interest on the debt is our first obligation. The second one is to pay our military personnel who are overseas, who are deployed, and to make sure they are not worrying about their families at home having the money to pay the mortgage and the bills that must be paid on top.

So I hope the Senate will take up this bill, and I am going to ask that we consider the Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act of 2011 is on the agenda if we are in session next week. That seems to be what is in the works right now. If that is the case, let's do something productive. I can't think of something more productive and more reassuring to our military than to pass S. 724, with 80 cosponsors. If it comes to the floor, it is going to pass. It will go to the House, and I assure you it will pass.

So let's start that process. If we are going to be here next week and a lot of plans are going to be disrupted, we are willing to do that. But let's make it worthwhile by passing significant legislation, such as ensuring that our military is paid on time if for any reason we are looking at a government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THANKING SENATOR HUTCHISON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, while the Senator from Texas is still on the floor, I just want to say how, personally, this Senator is going to miss her after the calendar year 2012, since she is retiring from the Senate. I say that with the utmost respect and affection for the Senator from Texas because what a great partner she has been in setting policy for this Nation's space program.

Had it not been for the Senator from Texas, we would not have that policy etched into law in the NASA bill that we passed last year and which now is the skeletal structure that we hang all the appropriations on going forward, giving a clear path, a clear direction, a clear roadmap for our Nation's space program. So I just wanted to thank the Senator from Texas in front of the Senate.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I appreciate so much the words of the Senator from Florida because, of course, he is not mentioning the great leadership he has portrayed.

He is today the only Member of the Senate who has actually gone into space as an astronaut, and his love for and zeal for our space exploration is unsurpassed, and I appreciated working with him.

It was our joint bill that passed last year that assures a way forward for NASA; that assures that there will be manned space exploration; that we will use the space station, in which we have invested hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, for not only health benefits for our country but also learning about dark energy. The dark energy and antimatter research that is being done right now, I witnessed myself last week when I visited the NASA facility at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX. We are now getting information on the cosmic rays that are coming into the spectrometer that has just been put on the space station by CDR Mark Kelly and his crew during the most recent shuttle mission, and we are going to possibly learn the genesis of the universe by this facility that was put aboard the space station and the research that is going to be done on dark matter and what happens when it meets matter. It is really exciting, and I believe that the way forward that Senator NELSON and I have put NASA on, I believe, is going to assure that we have private sector involvement; that there will eventually be a transition to the private sector, but in an orderly way so that we don't lose the expertise in which we have invested so much.

I hope later, before I leave, we will get a chance to talk about that. I am looking forward to going to the last launch of the space shuttle that America will put up. The systems that we have had will end after this last space launch that will happen in early July, and then we will be in the process of building the new vehicle which we have put in place in the law to begin to shorten the gap between the time that we can put Americans in space with

our own vehicle. We are going to try to make that a shorter timeframe by the law that we passed.

So, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida and look forward to having more opportunities to talk about the importance of space exploration and America's preeminence in that field.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator again. We stood shoulder to shoulder and we were able to get these two additional flights, which the Senator from Texas just chronicled, that no sooner had Mark Kelly and his crew put the alpha magnetic spectrometer up on the space station that it started collecting these cosmic rays.

These are subatomic particles that are flying around in space that we try to duplicate down here on Earth by smacking atoms together in accelerators to understand subatomic particles, and we have them out there being collected right now on the space station in the AMS. It was on the station one day after they put it there. It is collecting this. It is going to help us learn all the way back to the origin of the universe.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator would yield.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Of course.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. When I was there last week, Dr. Samuel Ting, who is the Nobel laureate from MIT who built the spectrometer and talked about and convinced us of the importance of putting it on the space station, he was there with Mark Kelly and myself, and he said they had 1 billion hits now of those cosmic rays and he was on a cloud, literally, about what they are learning already. Mark Kelly said, in a press conference that we had, that it was the most significant achievement that he has ever made in his entire career as an astronaut. I believe he will be proven right, and I think Dr. Samuel Ting will be eligible for another Nobel Prize in physics if we can really find the genesis of matter and antimatter in space, which he said we would; that you cannot duplicate on Earth except by trying to put these atom smashers and electron smashers on Earth but at much bigger expense than being able to do it in space where it just happens. Billions already, he said.

So thank you. I leave the floor. I know we digress, but it is very exciting.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Well, Mr. President, as the Senator is leaving, I just want to say that she and I did have to stand shoulder to shoulder, and we had some fights. Of course, in the process we had some critics too. Now some of my critics wish that when I went into space it would have been a one-way ticket. But the fact is, it was a two-way, and we stood another day. The proof is in the pudding of what is happening up there.

I will have something later to say, Mr. President, about the winddown of

the space shuttle program. But while the Senator from Texas was here, I just wanted her to know my profound gratitude for her collegiality, her friendship, her expertise, and working in the way this Senate ought to work, which is in a bipartisan way. I thank her profoundly for that example that she set for the Senate and for this country.

Mr. President, we are here about General Petraeus. I am a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I have had a chance to visit with him on a number of occasions in his capacity as general, as well as now the nominee, soon to be the new CIA Director.

I would simply say that I don't think for our national security's sake we could have two better nominees now: the former CIA Director, who has been confirmed by this Senate as the new Secretary of Defense, taking over from an extremely good and competent Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates—and, of course, that is Leon Panetta—and then for his shoes, as the leader of the CIA, to be filled by General Petraeus. And what is happening today is illustrated by the modus operandi of the takedown of bin Laden. It is a marriage between the intelligence community and the military community.

Of course, the takedown of bin Laden was exactly that: painstaking years of effort to get the intelligence, since bin Laden went dark after he slipped through our fingers in Tora Bora, and we knew he was communicating by a courier. So the question was, How did we find the courier? Once we identified who it was, where was he? Find him and follow him. That, of course, led us to the compound, and when married up with all of that intelligence on what was going on at that compound, then in came the U.S. military.

Although it was a CIA operation, as reported by the newspapers, led by Leon Panetta, in fact, it was a three-star admiral, a Navy SEAL, who conducted the actual raid from his headquarters. Of course, the SEALs took care of business and did it in such a proficient, effective, and magnificent way, and sequestered all of those women and children, save for the one woman, as reported in the newspaper, who got caught in the crossfire when the SEALs were fired at.

So it was an absolutely 100 percent operation, and it is illustrative of why this appointment of General Petraeus is so important and why the appointment of Leon Panetta as Secretary of Defense was so important. These two are going to be just like that, as we are protecting the national security for years to come.

That is what I want to say about General Petraeus.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on another subject—the budget—so I ask consent that I speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the negotiation over this deficit

reduction and the debt ceiling package has hit the critical stage. It is beginning to come into the consciousness of the country and most of the people around here. Those people have in some cases wanted to push it off, in other cases have said: Oh, the debt ceiling? That is not such a big deal.

It is baffling that people would say that. The economic chaos that would reign in this country and the world financial markets if the Federal Government was not able to pay all of its bills would be catastrophic. How can any person in a responsible position say that?

But it is also baffling that there are so many people—and you know who they are—who have decided to draw a line in the sand on any deficit reduction and say: It is going to be my way or no way. That is part of the problem of what is going on in this country right now. This is a big, broad, diverse, complicated country. The very principle of a body such as this is that you respect the other fellow's point of view. When you have differences of opinion, you try, as the Good Book says, to say, "Come, let us reason together" and to hammer out a workable solution. Yet you hear the rhetoric—it is going to be their way or no way, so no matter whether you talk about closing corporate tax loopholes—no. That has to do with tax revenue. It sure does, but certain people are not paying their taxes due to loopholes.

Two weeks ago, we acted on one of those tax loopholes overwhelmingly. This Senate voted to get rid of one of those tax loopholes. It was for corn ethanol, the big subsidy. It was multibillions of dollars per year that was a tax credit—in other words, lost tax revenue. The Senate finally realized that was not worthwhile.

Why are we saying we should not put that in as a part of the package on deficit reduction? A dollar of deficit reduction is a dollar of deficit reduction regardless of where it comes from, whether it comes from actually whacking Federal spending or whether it is cutting some of the special tax breaks for some of this country's most profitable multinational corporations. The objective is to bring down the deficit.

What is a deficit? You have income coming in the form of tax revenue, you have outflow going out in the form of expenditures, and when the two are equal, that is a balanced budget. When I came into the Senate 11 years ago, we had 4 years of this. Tax revenue was above annual expenditures, and for 4 years, we had a surplus. But this is what has happened: The expenditures are up here and the tax revenue is down here.

If you are going to get the budget eventually in balance over the course of a decade, you have to do this. That doesn't mean just tax increases. It can be done by eliminating tax expenditures. Over the next 10 years, tax expenditures in the existing Tax Code are \$14 trillion. You don't have to get rid of

all of them. Some of them we don't want to get rid of because they are good tax policy, they are good public policy. But you can sure get rid of some of them.

But we have the other side over there who will not even talk about some of these tax loopholes we ought to be cutting. They say that is increasing taxes. Now, the truth be known, it is because most of them, whether they like it or not, on that side of the aisle have taken a pledge to a fellow named Grover Norquist and said they will not vote for any new taxes, and it is being interpreted that tax expenditures—in other words, tax deductions, tax credits, or tax exclusions—that if you close those tax loopholes, that is going to be new taxes. Well, that is tax revenue that is not coming into the U.S. Treasury because some special interest is getting preferential treatment that we ought to question. A good example of this is what we just voted on in the removal of the tax subsidy for corn ethanol.

At the end of the day, for Americans, this debate is going to matter hugely. If we have to do something by just cutting expenditures and not remove the tax loopholes, then in order to address the deficit—remember, this is the deficit, this is expenditures, and this is tax revenue, and if we have to bring that into balance by only moving down the expenditures, we are going to have to take it out of the hide of retirees, out of the hide of hospitals, schools, what Senator HUTCHISON and I were just talking about, the space program, the coastal preservation programs, our national parks, and the Federal prisons. Are we going to put an end to the narrow tax breaks for the well-connected or are we just going to whack all of those programs?

The view of this Senator is that if you really want to get a package that is going to be serious and that is real money, that is not smoke and mirrors and budgetary sleight-of-hand, then you are going to have to get a package of about \$4 trillion in 10 years of deficit reduction.

There is no reason, if you are going to be serious about budget reduction, that special benefits for oil companies, for pharmaceutical companies, hedge funds, and other special interests should be a sacred cow and not to be touched. What message does it send to the everyday American about their government and whom that government represents if we just take it out of the hides of people such as those I just mentioned, like retirees?

Basically, I suggest you take a page from one of our illustrious former President, President Reagan. In 1984, the Federal Government was confronted by deficits as far as the eye could see. I was a young Congressman at the time. President Reagan understood that it was appropriate to close those tax loopholes as part of the deficit reduction process, and the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 included more

than 60 provisions aimed at shutting down tax shelters and ending abusive special interest tax breaks. That 1984 bill targeted foreign investors who sought to use the offshore havens to dodge U.S. taxes, and it targeted Wall Street's use of financial derivatives to evade U.S. income tax, and it included a provision targeting the windfall profits for oil companies.

That brings me to an example I want to discuss in some detail. For decades, oil companies have been enjoying the generous tax subsidies of the American taxpayer by using their ample resources to get tax benefits very generously given from the Federal Government. Oil and gas companies are experts at figuring out the narrow tax break, and it benefits their interest, and it does so particularly with regard to offshore drillers.

The largest of all the dedicated oil and gas tax breaks is the ability of the oil companies to immediately expense intangible drilling costs. These costs include drilling and development work completed before a well begins production. Oil companies are able to deduct—in other words, to write off as an expense—those costs and do so immediately.

The tax break for intangible drilling expenses is going to cost the American taxpayer \$12.4 billion over the next decade if it is not repealed. The President has proposed its repeal. Several of us in the Senate have proposed the repeal and have filed a bill to do it. The repeal of this tax break on intangible costs for oil companies ought to be included in a deficit reduction package. Remember, it is a choice: Are we going to cut people like retirees and the space program and educational expenses and the environment and the Federal prisons or are we going to get tax revenue from special tax breaks like these?

For several years, oil companies working offshore have been devoting significant resources toward complex tax schemes to avoid paying taxes to Uncle Sam. Let's take a closer look.

Transocean, that is a name that ought to ring familiar. They were the ones, remember, who operated the defective blowout preventer, the one that did not work, that was supposed to jam the two cylinders together and cut off the oil flow when there was an explosion on the Deepwater Horizon oil rig.

Let's look at the record. In 1999, Transocean moved its place of incorporation from Delaware to the Cayman Islands. In 2008, it moved from the Cayman Islands to Switzerland. This tax-avoidance operation, referred to as "corporate inversion," had no real effect on where Transocean does business. Even after it moved to the Cayman Islands, it continued to be, in fact, managed and controlled from Houston, TX. It continues to have substantial drilling activities in American waters. And by changing its legal domicile from Delaware to a tax haven in the Caribbean, Transocean was able to cut its tax bill nearly in half. Martin Sullivan, a former economist at the Joint

Commission on Taxation, estimates that Transocean's offshore tax scheme saved the company \$1.9 billion from 2002 to 2009. That is an example of one of these tax subsidies that ought to be eliminated. Congress shut down those corporate inversions in 2004 but only on a going-forward basis. Until Congress gets serious about taxing U.S.-managed companies that deceptively claim to be foreign corporations, Transocean and others will continue to benefit. Transocean is not alone. We know of at least five oil companies involved in offshore drilling that moved their legal domicile to a tax haven in the Caribbean in order to avoid paying U.S. income tax.

I will conclude by saying, unlike Transocean, BP has never been an American corporation. But it has no problem in reaping the benefits of our porous Tax Code. We learned soon after the \$20 billion claims facility was announced that BP would be writing off the entire expense for tax purposes, writing off all of that expense for the oil that was spilled that hurt so many of our residents in Florida and all up and down the gulf coast. They are going to write that off as a tax deduction, and, therefore, pay less taxes. We estimate this will reduce the tax burden by nearly \$9 billion for BP. Several of us have introduced legislation to shut down this abusive tax break as well, and it is another that we ought to put in this deficit reduction package.

I conclude by saying these corporate tax loopholes for oil companies should be part of any deficit reduction package, and this Senator is going to continue to stand up and fight to ensure they are a part of that deficit reduction package.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Petraeus nomination. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. In a few minutes we will be casting, I am sure, a 100-0 vote to confirm General David Petraeus as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and obviously his nomination is supported by all Members of the Senate, and I am sure all Americans, especially those, such as the Senator from South Carolina and myself, who have had the great privilege and honor of knowing General Petraeus for many years and watching him lead the men and women serving in our military in a fashion that I have never seen surpassed. The Senator from South Carolina has had the unique privilege and responsibility to serve under General Petraeus in uniform, because, as most of our colleagues know, the Senator

from South Carolina also serves as a colonel in the South Carolina National Guard and in the legal corps as a JAG officer.

The Senator from South Carolina has worked with General Petraeus both in Iraq and Afghanistan on many of the important issues concerning detainees as well as other issues. Before I ask the Senator from South Carolina for his comments, I wish to repeat what I said before. I don't believe that in my life, which has been blessed to know many outstanding military leaders of all branches of the service, I have ever quite encountered a military leader or civilian leader, for that matter, with the combination of charisma and intellect General Petraeus possesses. The Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I had the unique opportunity, among many visits we made to Iraq and Afghanistan, one Fourth of July in 2007 to be present at a reenlistment ceremony that took place in the palace in Baghdad. There were a couple of thousand spectators and there were well over 200 young men and women who had agreed to reenlist, to continue to serve in Iraq when they could have fulfilled their commitment they made to their families and a grateful nation. Instead, they chose to reenlist, to stay, and continue the fight. Part of that ceremony was to administer the oath of citizenship to over 75 people who were not born in the United States of America, who were not citizens, who were green card holders, who were legally in the United States as green card holders but had joined the military in order to serve and to achieve an accelerated path to citizenship.

What struck me at that ceremony was that in the front row there were three empty seats with boots on them of individuals who were green card holders who were scheduled to take the oath of citizenship and who had been killed in the previous few days in action, serving their country in Iraq.

I was privileged to speak. The Senator from South Carolina spoke. The Senator from Connecticut spoke. But when General David Petraeus spoke to those assembled men and women who are serving their country, it was very obvious of the not only respect but admiration every one of those young Americans felt for the inspirational leadership General Petraeus had provided them. I might point out it was a time when most experts and many politicians and Members of this body predicted the surge would fail. Well, I think what they didn't take into account was the incredible leadership and implementation of a strategy that was embodied by GEN David Petraeus and the young men and women who are serving.

So I am confident as we continue the fight against al-Qaida and the radical Islamic extremists who want to attack and destroy our country, that now General Petraeus, soon to be Director of

the CIA, will provide our Nation with the very best strategy, tactics, thought, and action to keep our Nation safe.

I don't very often come and talk about nominees and spend the Senate's time, but I know I express the appreciation and affection of all those men and women, both serving now and in the past, who had the great honor and privilege of serving under General Petraeus and to wish him a well done and smooth sailing and following winds as he assumes his new responsibilities which will continue to keep America safe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think our American military will be studying the Petraeus tactics and strategy that he implemented in Iraq and Afghanistan for generations to come. In January of 2007 when the surge was announced, I had had the pleasure of being over in Iraq in April, but I remember a letter issued by General Petraeus to all those under his command and it was basically entitled "Hard is not Hopeless." He explained in great detail in the letter how we would move forward as a nation, that it would be difficult, it would be hard, but not hopeless. I have seen the inspiration he provides to our men and women in uniform, and I cannot tell you how much this country owes General Petraeus and his family. He has been deployed almost continuously since 2001, but what he was able to accomplish in Iraq with the help of those under his command, he will be the first to say, they deserve the credit.

And now Afghanistan. He came into Afghanistan under very difficult circumstances, losing a commander in the field. The progress in the last year has been stunning. The Taliban in the south has been knocked down hard. There is a 90,000 increase in the Afghan national security forces. We have a new training program to train Afghan security forces, and I think it will pay great dividends.

To the President, you have chosen wisely in picking David Petraeus to be the Director of the CIA.

I am confident Director Petraeus will do as good a job for the country as General Petraeus, and that is saying a lot. Following Leon Panetta, who did a great job, we are in good hands as a nation. I don't believe any single person understands the threats America faces better than General Petraeus. At the CIA he will have a chance to take the fight to the enemy in a different way. We will not have available forever 100,000 troops to be used in theaters of battle.

We are going to bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. I hope we do it smartly based on conditions. But this fight is morphing into other countries, Yemen, Somalia, the Horn of Africa, and the Nation is playing a more crucial role in our Nation's defense than at any time in the history of the CIA. We will be blessed to have

David Petraeus to be Director of the CIA. He understands the threats. I think he will be able to marshal the resources of the CIA to keep the enemies on their heels and to reinforce to our allies that we are a reliable partner and to our enemies there is no place you can hide. There is no passage of time that will keep you safe from American justice.

I hope the Congress—I know Senator CHAMBLISS will, the Senate in particular—will listen to General Petraeus, who will soon be Director of Petraeus, about how to make sure the CIA is equipped and funded to take on the enemy. In this war on terror, we are fighting an idea. There is no capital to conquer, there is no air force to down, there is no navy to sink. We are battling an idea. And the way we ultimately become safe is to empower those who have the will to fight the terrorists in their backyard to provide them with the capacity to let the terrorists organizations know we will follow you to the gates of hell, that we will never relent. The CIA and the brave men and women who serve in that organization are becoming the tip of the spear in this battle. What happened in Somalia yesterday, what is going to happen in the future in Yemen and Somalia is a direct result of good intelligence and national will.

To Senator MCCAIN and those who have gotten to know General Petraeus, I can assure you that President Obama chose wisely. This is the perfect job for David Petraeus to take up for the Nation. He has the understanding of the threats we face and the CIA is the platform we will be using against the enemy more effectively than any other platform I know.

With that, I look forward to casting my vote for Director of the CIA David Petraeus, and I hope everybody in this body will provide a vote of confidence to General Petraeus. He has earned this. America is in good hands with David Petraeus being the CIA Director.

I yield. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is on the Petraeus nomination.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David H. Petraeus, of New Hampshire, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) would each vote "yea."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Alexander	Graham	Murray
Ayotte	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Harkin	Paul
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heller	Pryor
Bingaman	Hoeven	Reed
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reid
Blunt	Inouye	Risch
Boozman	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kohl	Shelby
Coats	Kyl	Snowe
Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Lautenberg	Tester
Collins	Lee	Thune
Conrad	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Inhofe	Moran
Burr	Leahy	Udall (NM)

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was absent for the rollcall vote on the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today, I was unavoidably absent for vote No. 104. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the nomination of GEN David H. Petraeus to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.●

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislation session.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet today at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, July 5, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res 20, a joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the U.S. Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a very important issue. I understand a number of my colleagues have worked very hard to bring this issue to the floor.

But the fact is, it simply does not address the fact that we are bankrupting this Nation. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have conferred with my friend, the Republican leader. There will be no more votes today or tomorrow. Our first vote will be next Tuesday.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m. tonight, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

BIG OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I regret that our colleagues have objected to a consent request to go to some of the most critical issues the country is facing—to have the Finance Committee meet on trade agreements that could expand markets and ultimately create jobs in America, and that is what we need in America—to create jobs. On the question of whether there